

REMARKS

In the Office Action,¹ the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4-15, 17-19, 21, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0015042 to *Robotham*.

By this response, Applicants have amended claims 1, 14 and 18. Support for the amendments can be found, for example, on page 2, lines 20-24, page 8, lines 3-10, and Figure 4. Claims 3, 16, and 20 were previously cancelled and claim 10 is cancelled in this paper without disclaimer or prejudice. Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11-15, 17-19, 21, and 22 remain pending.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-15, 17-19, 21, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Robotham*. Although elements of claim 10 now appear in claim 1, the rejection with respect to claim 10 is moot due to its canceled status. In order to properly establish that *Robotham* anticipates Applicants' claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102, each and every element of each of the claims in issue must be found, either expressly described or under principles of inherency, in that single reference. See M.P.E.P. § 2131, quoting *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Furthermore, “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim.” See M.P.E.P. § 2131, quoting *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1126, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

¹ The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Robotham does not disclose each and every element of Applicants' claimed invention. Claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, instructions to "detect a period of inactivity comprising a predefined time interval where no user input is received; after detecting the period of inactivity, identify on the client one or more possible user interaction events" and "pre-process one or more of the possible user interaction events to generate one or more possible user interface states." The Examiner alleges that "automatic triggers" and "a refresh when the age exceeds a certain threshold" of *Robotham* anticipate this portion of the claim. Office Action, page 9. This is not correct.

The "automatic triggers" of *Robotham* do not constitute instructions to "detect a period of inactivity comprising a predefined time interval where no user input is received" and "after detecting the period of inactivity, identify on the client one or more possible user interaction events," as claimed. Instead, the "automatic triggers" of *Robotham* are used so that an "associated input action can be automatically generated to initiate [a] . . . transaction . . . based on one or more criteria such as a time interval." Paragraph 0232. However the "time interval" of *Robotham* is not associated with any "predefined time interval where no user input is received," as claimed.

In addition, the "transaction" of *Robotham* is not one where "one or more possible user interaction events" are "identif[ied] on the client," as claimed. Instead, the "transaction" of *Robotham* completes a "bookmark function" for "appl[ying] the specified input field(s) to a rendered representation of the reference visual content element." Paragraphs 232 and 226. That is, the "bookmark function" of *Robotham* fails to lead to

any “identifying” of “possible user interaction events,” as claimed. Therefore, the “automatic triggers” of *Robotham* do not constitute instructions to “detect a period of inactivity comprising a predefined time interval where no user input is received” and “after detecting the period of inactivity, identify on the client one or more possible user interaction events,” as claimed.

The Office Action further alleges that a “refresh when the age exceeds a certain threshold” of *Robotham* constitutes elements of claim 1. See Office Action, page 9. This is not correct. In particular, the “age,” or “difference between the current time and the time when the cached representation was received from [a] server,” as disclosed by *Robotham* (Paragraph 0300), is not associated with any “predefined time interval where no user input is received,” as claimed. Moreover, *Robotham* does not disclose any “identification” of “one or more possible user interaction events” after “detecting the period of inactivity,” as claimed. Instead, when an “age exceeds a certain threshold,” a client “requests a refresh” of a cached representation. Paragraph 0300. Therefore, *Robotham* fails to teach instructions to “detect a period of inactivity comprising a predefined time interval where no user input is received” and “after detecting the period of inactivity, identify on the client one or more possible user interaction events,” as claimed.

Because *Robotham* does not disclose each and every element recited by claim 1, *Robotham* cannot anticipate this claim, and claim 1 is allowable over the art of record. Claims 2, 4-9, 11-13 and 22 are also allowable at least due to their dependence from claim 1.

Independent claims 14 and 18, though of different scope from claim 1, recite elements similar to those set forth above for claim 1. Claims 14 and 18 are therefore allowable for at least the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1. Claims 15, 17, 19, and 21 are also allowable at least due to their respective dependence from claims 14 and 18. For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11-15, 17-19, 21, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: November 20, 2008

/Krystyna Colantoni/
By: _____
Krystyna Colantoni
Reg. No. 60,226